



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to avoid discussion on the subject in parliament or anywhere else.

But the subject of this letter is to call on you to declare the doctrine of your church on oaths, and political obligations—to say whether you consider it lawful to take an oath against the interest of your church (*the taking of which your own law pronounces to be perjury*), with no intention of keeping that oath, but taking it solely as a means of deceiving others.

And let me again remind you of the awful position in which Mr. Lucas stands—pledged to you and to your clergy to do this, and sent by you and your clergy to parliament to do it.

Surely, if ever a bishop was called on to direct any man's conscience, you are called on to direct Mr. Lucas in this.

I have the honour to be, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient servant,

EDWARD A. STOPFORD,
Archdeacon of Meath.

The foregoing letter was probably written before the following was published, which we take from Mr. Lucas's speech at the declaration of the members at the Meath election, as published in the *Tablet*, July 31, page 494, col. 2, which we add here, as it shows Mr. Lucas's own understanding of the grounds on which he is sent to parliament—"If we remain true to the principles on which we have been sent into parliament—if we keep to the principles of Sharman Crawford's Bill, *hostility to the Established Church, AND THE ABOLITION* of that odious monopoly," &c., &c. This puts the view taken in the foregoing letter, of Mr. Lucas's position, beyond all question.

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE HOLY FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In my letter on the above subject, which appears in your publication of this month, I did not, as you are pleased to represent, quote the Book of Maccabees as Scripture, but as an authentic *historical testimony* depositing to a fact which cannot be denied, that the practice of praying for the dead was the same among the ancient Jews as among the early Christians and Roman Catholics of the present day (read fourth paragraph of my letter).

I did not state the Book of Maccabees was any portion of the public worship of the Jews, or that they ever acknowledged that book as Scripture, given by inspiration of God; but I boldly affirmed that *prayers for the dead* formed part and parcel of the public worship of the Jews; and I now reiterate my inquiry, why such a practice did not meet the censure and condemnation of Christ and his Apostles?

That is the question to which I expect a direct answer, and not whether the Book of Maccabees be apocryphal or otherwise.

With respect to your observations on my quotations from some of the Fathers of the three and four first centuries, I leave your readers to exercise their private judgment and arrive at their own conclusions. I just beg, however, to observe, that you take no notice whatever of some of the early Fathers declaring the practice of praying for the dead to be of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION. St. Chrysostom is decisive on the point (*Homil. 3, in Epist. ad Philip.*), and (*in Homil. 21*) states the solemn usage to have been ordained by the DIVINE SPIRIT. WARNER CHRISTIAN SEARCH.

July, 1852.

On the above letter we wish to say, in the first place, that it is our most earnest desire to do the fullest justice, and to act with perfect candour towards those who enter into discussion in our pages. Above all, we desire never to misrepresent their arguments. We should be unworthy of their contributions if we did. We are liable to mistake the point of an argument unintentionally; and, in such a case, we shall always be ready to acknowledge and correct our error, and thankful for the opportunity of doing so.

In this instance, we have mistaken "W. C. Search's" argument from the Book of Maccabees; and he has given us the opportunity of answering more to the point; and we gladly avail ourselves of it.

The argument is this—"Although we should regard the second Book of Maccabees merely as an account, written by an uninspired historian of fair character and credit, even in that view it is a sufficient testimony that the Jews did actually practise prayers and sacrifice for the repose of departed souls, just as the Roman Catholic Church does now; and that this was part of the public worship of the Jewish Church in our Saviour's time; and, since he did not reprove the Jews for this, his silence must be taken as admitting it to be right." We trust that "W. C. Search" will think the

above a candid statement of his argument; and we acknowledge it deserves a better answer than we have yet given it. And we now offer the following answer—

We agree to take the writer of this book as a historian worthy of that credit which is given to historians of fair character; but we do not acknowledge him to be infallible through Divine inspiration, and "W. C. Search" does not require us to admit this.

Before we can rely on this writer's "historical testimony," we must know exactly what his testimony is. We cannot be bound by an erroneous translation; the writer wrote in Greek, and we must look to the Greek, which he wrote, to learn his testimony with accuracy.

We look anxiously for the most authentic copy of the Greek, and we have no hesitation in adopting, for this purpose, an ancient manuscript, belonging to the Pope, which is carefully preserved, in the Pope's library in the Vatican. This book is, at least, 1,200 years old, if not more. There is no copy that can compare with it in point of authority, except the Alexandrian Manuscript, now in the British Museum; and the two copies agree in the place in question, and every other Greek copy of Maccabees agrees with them too; so we have no room to doubt what the writer did really write in the Greek. And we are able to make use of that valuable manuscript in the Pope's library, because an exact copy of it was printed in the year 1587, by the authority of Pope Sixtus the Fifth.

We now give an exact translation from the Greek as then published by Pope Sixtus; and we place beside it the translation in the Douay Bible, that our readers may compare the two. 2 Macc. xii. 43, &c. :—

DOUAY TRANSLATION.

43. And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

44. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)

45. And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.

46. It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.

We have printed in Italics the places in which the difference is important; and we give here the corresponding Greek words, that those learned in that language may satisfy themselves which translation is correct. In v. 43, the Greek words are, Προσαγαγειν περι αμαρτιας θνητων. In v. 46, οσια και ενσους η επινοια. οθεν περι των τεθνηκοτων τον εξιλασμον ποιησατο, της αμαρτιας απολυθηται. We appeal to all Greek scholars if we have not translated this correctly.

Observe, now, in v. 43, the historian does not say in the Greek (what the Douay version is thought to say) that Judas Maccabeus offered the sacrifice for the benefit of the dead. He says nothing of the dead; he only says, that it was offered on account of sin.

Observe, next, in v. 46, what the writer says about a holy and pious thought is not spoken of what follows (as the Douay translation makes it appear), but of what goes before. Every Greek scholar will see that it is impossible to connect these words in the Greek with what follows. It was the belief in a reward for those who die the death of the righteous, that the author of this book called a holy and pious thought.

Observe, lastly, that the Douay Bible, in v. 46, again applies the benefit to the dead—"to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." But the writer in the Greek does not say so. He does not say that the dead might be loosed; he does not say who were to be loosed, but he says that Judas made an atonement concerning, or on account of, the dead; he does not say for the dead, for then he would have written υπερ, whereas he has written περι, concerning the dead; and he does not say that they should be loosed, but "to be loosed," which might be for Judas himself, and for others, if living: for if the sins of the dead had brought the living under sin, an atonement would be required for the living, because of the dead.

We observe here that "W. C. Search" has argued only from v. 43 & 46; he has not referred to v. 44. We therefore, answer here only from the verses he relies on, and we will consider v. 44 separately.

From verses 43 and 46, rightly translated, our answer is clear. The sacrifice was offered, and the atonement was made, not for the dead, but for the living.

It is a fact that, according to the law of Moses, the sin of those who were slain had brought guilt upon the whole nation of the living, which required to be atoned for by sacrifice, according to the Jewish law.

We have a clear instance of such a case in the Book of Joshua, ch. 7, v. 1—"But the children of Israel transgressed the commandment, and took to their own use of the anathema. For Achan, the son of Charni, &c., took something of the anathema, and the Lord was angry against the children of Israel." Here observe that one man only committed the sin, and it was unknown to the rest, for he hid the thing in the ground (v. 21), and yet it brought God's anger on the whole people.

Now, the sin on account of which Judas Maccabeus offered sacrifice, was exactly of the same kind. "They found under the coats of the slain some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews."—2 Macc. xii. 40. This was the anathema, or accursed thing, which they, like Achan, had taken; and in the same way it brought God's anger on the nation.

And the punishment was like in both cases. In Achan's case, the people, after a succession of victories, in which none of them were killed, were put to flight before their enemies, and many of them killed, because of what Achan had done. Just so Judas Maccabeus, after many victories, met with a check, and some of his soldiers were killed: and when they came to bury them, they found the reason, that they had taken of the cursed thing.

There was this difference in the two cases—In Achan's case, the guilty man was not killed. The atonement consisted in putting him to death, by God's command; but there was sacrifice too, for all his sheep and oxen were burned—Joshua vii. 24, 25, 26. But in the case before us, the idolaters were slain. Judas, therefore, could not make atonement for the guilt that had been brought upon the nation, by putting them to death; and it was his duty to look to the law of Moses and see what atonement was directed for such a case. This he would find exactly prescribed in the Book of Leviticus, chapter iv., from verse 13 to 31 inclusive. In those circumstances it was the duty of Judas Maccabeus to have such a sacrifice offered at Jerusalem, not for the benefit of the dead, but that the living might be delivered from the sin or guilt which the wickedness of the slain had brought upon the whole people. And on looking back to the correct translation which we have given of verses 43 and 46, it will be seen that every word is exactly suitable to such a sacrifice: for instance, when Judas provided the sacrifice, by a "collection made man by man," it was evidently that each of the people should contribute to the atonement, which was made for the people as a whole: if the sacrifice had been for the benefit of the dead, it would have been enough to collect from those who desired to give.

This is the true account of what is related in those two verses, because this is what Judas was bound to do, according to the law of Moses, which was the only rule that it was lawful for him to follow in that matter. "W. C. Search" will, no doubt, acknowledge that Jews were strictly bound by the law of Moses, both as to the manner of offering sacrifice and the purpose for which it was to be offered; excepting only in the case of persons inspired and directed by God, which no one supposes was the case with Judas.

Now, we have shown that, according to that law, it was his duty to offer that sacrifice for the living; and we have shown that the two verses on which "W. C. Search" relies, when rightly translated, are most appropriate to that sacrifice which the law required for the living, and that those verses do not say it was for the dead. Now, can "W. C. Search" show us, from the law of Moses, that it was Judas's duty to offer sacrifice for the dead? We urge this upon him. If he cannot (and we know he cannot) will he not agree with us that Judas offered his sacrifice according to the law, and not contrary to the law, seeing that Judas was bound by that law, and was a most strict observer of it?

We have now given a full answer, as respects those two verses which "W. C. S." argues from. We will now go on and consider v. 44, which he has not introduced into his argument.

"W. C. Search" has laid it down most plainly that, for the purpose of this discussion, the writer of that book is to be considered as an uninspired historian of fair character and credit. As such we consider him. It is a rule in judging of all such historians, that a great difference is to be made between the facts which the historian relates and his own reflections upon those facts. The one may be most correct, the other most erroneous. The difference is greater still between the actions which the historian records, and the historian's guess, for it can be little more than a guess, at the secret thoughts which led the actor to do what he did. "W. C. Search" must surely have observed the importance of this distinction, in reading even historians of the highest character and credit.

The highest praise an historian can obtain is, that he keeps the facts which he records distinct from his own reflections on those facts—that he does not allow his own reflections to influence the account of the facts.

The writer of this book has done it admirably. He evidently connected in his own mind this sacrifice with the deal, rather than with the living; yet where he relates the sacrifice—v. 43 and 46—he does not say it was for the dead; he describes it exactly as it was, in the true translation. Verse 44 is not the relation of the fact, but his own reflection on the fact, which may be right or wrong, without injury to his character for fidelity as an historian.

We are, therefore, to consider this verse not as the relation of a fact, but as the inference which he drew from the fact he relates.

Now, how could the writer of this book know the secret thoughts of Judas's mind? How could he know that Judas was *thinking* of the resurrection? If the writer was inspired he could know it; but if he was only an uninspired man, it could only be a guess.

Now, we are prepared to affirm that this writer was wrong in supposing that Judas offered this sacrifice with any regard to the resurrection of those who were slain. And still more, we are prepared to expect that "W. C. Search" himself will, on reflection, agree with us that the writer was wrong in this (though, perhaps, not on exactly the same grounds that we think so). Now, let "W. C. Search" mark this; the man who died on that occasion died in mortal sin. They carried in their clothes the proofs of their idolatry; perhaps in hopes to have the protection of the heathen gods in the battle; but whatever their motive, their sin was idolatry, which was a mortal sin. "W. C. Search" will not deny this. Even the note on the Douay Bible acknowledges the sin of which they were guilty to be a mortal sin, which cannot be denied, if we look to Deuteronomy vii. 25, 26. That note in the Douay Bible supposed these men might be excused through ignorance; but how could any Jew be ignorant that heathen idolatry was a mortal sin? what Jew could be ignorant that heathen idols were the accursed thing? Let "W. C. Search" mark this; if that sacrifice was offered for the dead, it was offered for those that were known and known to have died in mortal sin.

Let "W. C. Search" now look back to this sentence in his letter from above, in which he brings this history as a proof "that the practice of praying for the dead was the same among the ancient Jews, as among the early Christians, and Roman Catholics of the present day." If that history of the Maccabees prove anything at all of the practice of the Jews about prayer and sacrifice for the dead, it proves that they prayed and sacrificed for those who died in mortal sin, that they might be loosed from their sins. Do "Roman Catholics of the present day" pray and offer sacrifice for those who die in mortal sin, that they may be loosed from their sins? "W. C. Search" will tell us that they do not—that they consider this a wicked and heretical doctrine; and that it is condemned by their church as such. How, then, can he tell us that this history proves that the practice of the Jews was the same as theirs?

We have only to add one word on "W. C. Search's" argument from the silence of Christ. To make the argument of any force it would be necessary that the practice in question should be shown to have been a constant part of the public worship of the Jews—that is to say, that they practised it *always and continually* as a part of their public worship. If it was a thing done only once, 163 years before Christ, and not repeated from day to day continually, then our Saviour's silence concerning it is no approbation, any more than his silence about any other act of the Jews, in former times, is an approbation of it. Now, the history of it, even as it is given in the Douay translation, does not profess to speak of what was done always and from day to day among the Jews, but only of what was done on that particular occasion. But we need not insist further on this; if the history proves anything of the practice of the Jews in our Saviour's time, it proves that their public worship then comprised prayer and sacrifice for those who died in mortal sin, that they might be loosed from their sins. Will "W. C. Search" say that our Saviour by his silence, or any other way, approved of this? If he did, why did the Church of Rome condemn it now, as she certainly does?

We now appeal to "W. C. Search" whether this be not conclusive proof that the reflections which the writer of this book of 2nd Maccabees makes on the facts which he records, are uninspired, and subject to error? Will he now maintain that the opinion of this writer, contradictory as it is not only to the doctrine of the Gospel, but even to the teaching of the Church of Rome, must needs be inspired? We add nothing to this, but that the writer of this book is allowed to have been a Greek, and, as such, may have had no opportunity of witnessing the public worship of the Jews. See Acts xxi. 28, 29.

The writer of this has been compelled to consider this subject in a brief space of time, and under a great pressure of other business. He now thanks "W. C. Search" for having forced him to do it. He feels it to be a practical proof to himself of the value of the discussion and researches which this journal was intended to promote, and which "W. C. Search" has efficiently promoted; and he trusts that "W. C. Search" will now feel that the writers in this journal desire rightly

to understand and to do full justice to the arguments of opponents, that they are ready to acknowledge an error when they have committed it, and that they are anxious only for a fair discussion of important questions, with a view to the promotion of truth.

We must be brief on the remainder of this letter. "W. C. Search" says—"With respect to your observations on my quotations from some of the Fathers of the three and four first centuries, I leave your readers to exercise their private judgment, and arrive at their own conclusions." Our answer was this—that quotations from the three first centuries only were applicable to the letter which "W. C. Search" undertook to answer—that he brought only two witnesses from those three centuries for the doctrine of Purgatory—of whom we had to say, "One of them believed it only after he left the Catholic Church; the other, who was always a Catholic, never believed it at all." We refer our readers back to that article for the proofs we gave (July number, pages 81 and 82); and we join with "W. C. Search" in leaving it to our readers to exercise their private judgment, and arrive at their own conclusions.

"W. C. Search" complains that we did not take notice of all the passages which he quoted. We beg to repeat the reason that we then gave—"We have purposely omitted the proofs which 'W. C. Search' has brought from the fourth century, because they are no answer at all to the question, whether purgatory can be proved from the writings of the first three centuries. Our business in this article is to examine that article by itself. We shall, however, examine them (the proofs from the fourth century) on some other occasion." It was our intention to have done so in this number, but having to insert this reply to his present letter has prevented us; but we hope to perform this promise in our next number.

WHAT IS PURGATORY?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—You have been discussing with some of your correspondents, in the last number, whether the early Fathers believed in a Purgatory; but perhaps it may be well first to come to an agreement what Purgatory is. Your Loughrea correspondent, who signs himself "A Catholic," says, that anything short of absolutely perfect bliss is a punishment or purgation. If this be the test, it is easy to prove not only that the Fathers believed in Purgatory, but that the Church of England believes in it too. For she distinctly teaches in her Burial Service that we cannot have our perfect consummation and bliss until we have it in body and soul, when the soul is re-united to the body. But she also teaches that the souls of the faithful departed are in joy and felicity, and so differs from Romish divines, who teach that the majority of the faithful departed have to suffer torments equal to those of hell in severity, though not in duration. When, therefore, I ask whether the early Fathers believed in a Purgatory, what I want to know is, whether they believed that the souls of the faithful departed were in a state of joy or felicity, or in a state of torment; but I do not ask whether they imagined that the faithful departed are all at once admitted to the highest happiness which they shall ever attain; for I know that they agree with the Church of England in teaching that they are not. Can, therefore, any of your correspondents tell me of any Father of the first three centuries, who teaches that there is a Purgatory (meaning thereby a state of torment) for the righteous after death? But it will be irrelevant to produce quotations showing that those Fathers prayed for the dead, since this fact only proves that they supposed these souls not yet to have attained to perfect happiness, which is not denied. As long as one's happiness admits of any doubt there is room for prayer. Prayers for the dead, then, only prove a Purgatory, in your Loughrea correspondent's sense of the word—namely, a state something short of absolutely perfect happiness; but I want to see the passages produced, if such there be, which prove that either the Apostles or their successors believed in a Purgatory in the sense of a place of torment.—I remain, yours,

A TRUE CATHOLIC.

INDULGENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Cape Clear, July 24, 1852.

SIR—The following respectful letter was addressed on the 16th of June, to the Right Rev. Dr. KEANE, R. C. Bishop of this diocese (Ross). As I have not yet been favoured with an answer, perhaps you, sir, cannot employ your pen more acceptably or profitably, for the edification of your numerous Roman Catholic readers, than by giving the required information. Your reading appears so extensive, and you seem to have access to so many good authorities, that you will probably not have much difficulty in doing so. As you will, doubtless, state fully and fairly the Roman Catholic notion of such matters, you will be pleased to add something of the grounds on which Protestants refuse to avail themselves of a provision said to be replete with such wonderful blessings. Should the bishop still condescend to answer my humble communication, you and your readers shall

have the full benefit of what he says. But if he should not, he may, notwithstanding, deem the learned statements of the editor of so widely circulated a paper as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN not entirely beneath his notice; so I think it would be only fair and respectful to send to his address, at Skibbereen, a copy of the number in which the accompanying letter shall appear with your remarks.

To satisfy him that in writing to him, as I have done, I have been acting in deference to the high authority of a Pope, I beg to call his attention to Pope Leo's Bull for the observance of a jubilee, in the year 1825, in which that pontiff says—"To you, therefore, venerable brethren, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of indulgences." Moreover, the great advantage which the Church of Rome boasts of possessing over other Christian communities is that of having a "living, speaking tribunal" to refer to in every case of uncertainty or doubt. In each diocese I presume that speaking tribunal to be the bishop, no higher (such as councils or popes) being accessible to ordinary inquirers; and if he, when referred to, refuses to "speak," what good is he, or how does he maintain, on that head, the pretensions of his church?

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,

EDWARD SPRING.

"TO THE RIGHT REV. DR. KEANE, ETC., ETC."

"RIGHT REV. SIR—A late number of a Roman Catholic newspaper (*the Limerick and Clare Examiner*), publishes a document 'read aloud by the Rev. Mr. Synan, P. P., in St. Michael's Chapel, Limerick, on Sunday, the 6th instant, in which it is stated that 'the Pope has granted an indulgence of seven years, and as many forty days, to all the faithful of Christ who, with a contrite heart, shall visit a cross lately erected in the yard of that chapel, and recite seven Ave Marias in honour of the seven dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and that 'this indulgence may be gained every day.' Also, that the Pope has granted plenary indulgences upon the performance of other conditions in connection with a visit to the same cross, 'which indulgences can be applied to the souls in purgatory.'

"As I presume there can be no question about the authenticity of this document, may I take the liberty of seeking to be informed respecting its meaning, by you, right reverend sir, as the chief representative, in this diocese, of the high ecclesiastical personage by whom the specified favours are said to be bestowed? I assure you that, in doing so, I am not actuated by any motive of impertinence, but wish to get from one whom I can regard as competent authority information in a matter which I don't understand. Upon the subject of Papal indulgences I have frequently consulted the writings of both Protestants and Roman Catholics, and from none that I have met have I been able entirely to satisfy myself as to all that is contemplated by them or the precise nature and extent of the benefits which they are designed to confer.

"What, therefore, I now respectfully ask you to tell me is, First—what *exactly* is meant by 'an indulgence of seven years and as many forty days.' Secondly—whether by the words, 'this indulgence may be gained every day,' I am to understand that the benefits may be multiplied by the number of days (be they many or few) on which the cross is visited, and the other conditions performed. Thirdly—what are the precise benefits designed to be conveyed by a Plenary indulgence. And fourthly—how it is intended we should understand the expression, 'which indulgences can be applied to the souls in purgatory.' In addition to my other queries, may I ask you what are 'the seven dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary,' and how are they understood to be honoured by the 'recital' of 'seven Ave Marias'?

"It is right I should inform you that any information you may be kind enough to favour me with, I shall feel at liberty to use as I think proper, and remain, right reverend sir, your very humble servant,

EDWARD SPRING,

"Curate of Clear."

[We feel obliged to our reverend correspondent for the foregoing communication, and should the Right Rev. Dr. Keane decline to furnish him with the information he desires, we shall endeavour to do so from authentic sources in our next number.]

FARM OPERATIONS FOR AUGUST.

(From the *Irish Farmers' Gazette*.)

In the more favoured portions of the country, harvesting the cereals will be in active operation during the month.

Wheat will, in most places, be fit for cutting before the grain gets hard, or is thoroughly ripened. The most approved period is indicated when the grain, being bruised by the fingers, exhibits a tough, doughy appearance, but perfectly free from milk. Cut in this state, it yields more flour and less bran than if cut too early, and it gets riper. There is no loss incurred by shedding, and it commands a better price in the market, from the brightness of the sample, but much of this depends on the weather; if it be fine and warm, the grain will absorb all the sap still remaining in the straw, and ripen in